

Application No. 10/774,713

REMARKS

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 9, 11 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed since in Applicants' view one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand the claims as presented, particularly with the benefit of the teachings of the present application. In this regard, the Examiner is referred to page 27, beginning at paragraph [0053], and continuing on to page 28, paragraph [0055].

The rejection of Claims 1 to 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art cited on page 2, paragraph 4, of the Official Action is respectfully traversed since it is believed that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the combination of components as recited, for example, in rejected Claim 1. Nevertheless, Applicants, noting that Claims 7, 10 and 12 to 29 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, have amended Claim 1 as indicated by incorporating the subject matter thereof of Claim 7 therein. Similar remarks are applicable to Claims 9 and 11. Also, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Claim 30 has been clarified to replace a suitable substituent with alkyl or aryl.

Accordingly, it is respectfully urged that the Examiner reconsider his position and issue a Notice of Allowance to Applicants.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 10/774,713

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby requested to call Eugene O. Palazzo, at Telephone Number 585-423-1687, Rochester, New York.

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene O. Palazzo
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 20,881
(585) 423-4687

EOP/jah

December 2, 2005

Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20A
Rochester, New York 14644

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

-12-